

Water Quality Advisory Group
July 12, 2000
Room 1319

Minutes

Members present: Rae Schnapp, Bowden Quinn, Bill Beranek, Tom Anderson, Senator Gard, Melanie Darke, John Wilkins, John Fekete and Matt Rueff.

Audience: Dana Reed Wise, Bob Johnson, Eric Fry, Kari Simonelic, Ted Heemstra, Neil Parke, Doug Bley, Maggie McShane, Barb Loller, John Humes, Tonya Galbraith and Bill Hayden.

Introductions

John F: I would like to have a meeting in a couple weeks to go over specific questions and outlines. We would like to have recommendations by August.

Presentation by Denny Clark regarding Federal Antidegradation Policy. Our policy will need to comply with federal requirements.

Bill: You are dividing this up into antidegradation policy and antidegradation implementation. You said the federal guidance is coming and is the same as our policy.

Denny: No – our policy would apply to EPA policy. We have very little guidance as to how the state's will implement this policy.

Bill: Our policy is okay.

Denny: Our challenge is to advise on implementation. We have the opportunity to go through what we have and determine what is good and bad. We also have the opportunity to add comments.

John: We want to focus on antidegradation with a list of questions we have handed out. We will meet again in a couple weeks to go over these questions.

Denny: When focusing on antidegradation we need to focus on existing water quality not criteria.

Bill: How far from the criteria can we go?

Denny: Antidegradation is implemented parameter by parameter.

Bill: We must protect the use of the water. What is the harm? What is the goodness?

Tier I and Tier II say maintain and protect.

Denny: We now have some guidance with 431.

Tom: Implementation procedures have to be approved by EPA?

Denny: Yes.

John: As we continue our discussions we need to understand the variance process and clarify it with the antidegradation process.

Bill: Meet the criteria in the stream. Some may argue they cannot meet this criteria. The second step is the antidegradation. We are only talking about the polices for the second step.

Denny: There has to be some economic or social benefit. Unless they show excessive hardship, that may be grounds for a variance.

John F: Part of the debate is people talking past each other. Everyone needs to be in sync.

Rae: Antidegradation hasn't been clear. I understand the confusion.

Denny: Most difficult part will be dealing with Tier II.

Rae: There has to be a trigger doesn't there?

Denny: Right now the trigger is the lowering of the water quality.

Tom: 303(d): any increased discharge of pollutants to a water body that is already impaired by that pollutant.

Barb: Will look into that for the next meeting.

John: Table (describing Antidegradation Policy framework that was put together earlier this year) has been updated (by Bob Johnston).

Bob J.: *Review of table.*

Bowden: Would like us to focus on non-point source rather than focus on the discharger. That way we would not have to lower the quality of the water.

Denny: Cost effective methods to control non-point source pollution.

Tom: Example would be Rule 5.

John F.: Have four documents presented today. Would like to have another meeting in two weeks. We will take a look at the questions raised here and any others raised. Our purpose is to respond to those questions and come up with a recommendation. July 27, 2000 at 10:00. Let's number the documents so you can refer to them with comments.

Matt: Introduction of Dana Reed Wise, Chief of Staff.

John F.: Thanks everyone for your participation today. We will have the regular meeting on August 9th at 10:00.

Adjournment